

**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
April 26, 2006**

Scott Ward, Chairman called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 26, 2006.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Board Members Present: Scott Ward, Chairman; Ray Acuna, Ex Officio; DeWayne Justice, Vice Chair; Hemant Patel; Ex Officio; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio; Melvin Martin, Secretary.

Board Members Absent: Kent Cooper,

Staff Members Present: Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Timothy S. Phillips P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager; Mike Alexander, Chief Financial Officer; Russ Miracle, P.E., Division Manager, Planning and Project Management; Joe Tram, Acting Regulatory Division Manager, Linda Reinbold, Administrative Coordinator; Anna Medina, Clerk of the Flood Control Advisory Board.

Guests Present: Burton Charron, Peoria; Cedric Balozian, FCD; Elliot Silverston, VRS; Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Geraldine Roll, MCAO

1) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 26, 2006.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Martin and seconded by Mr. Justice to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

2) ROSE GARDEN LANE CHANNEL PROJECT

To determine whether the Advisory Board should endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors approve IGA FCD2005A007 which defines the responsibilities of the Flood Control District and the City of Peoria for the construction of the Rose Garden Lane Channel Project.

ReRick: Good afternoon Chairman, members of the board. This afternoon's agenda item number two is for the presentation for your endorsement of the Rose Garden Lane Channel Project Construction IGA FCD2005A007. The action requested of you this afternoon is to endorse and recommend to the Board of Directors that they approve this IGA with the City of Peoria for the construction management, operation and maintenance of the Rose Garden Lane Channel Project.

Briefly, some background on the project. This is one of actually nine different projects that were recommended through the Glendale/Peoria ADMP update, which was completed in 2001. The Peoria City Council did adopt this ADMP and its recommendations. In 2001 the Board of Directors adopted the resolution for the project. In 2004 the Board of Directors approved the IGA for the design and rights of way acquisition for the project. The City of Peoria is the lead agency for the project; they are the lead agency for all tasks. Presently the design is moving toward 90 percent. We had a progress meeting this morning, in fact, and we anticipate the 90 percent submittal of plans and specifications to be made in mid-May.

This graphic presents to you the components of the project and the geography of the project. We have Lake Pleasant Road here, we have Rose Garden Lane, and we have the Agua Fria River. This is approximately the 111th Avenue alignment here. The project consists of a channel feature along the north side of Rose Garden Lane. At the time the study was done this property was not developed. The concept included the channel through this area. Because these homes are now in place on these lots, we have a jog in the channel, which you see here. Box culvert under the roadway and then we come back to a channel alignment going to the west. We turn north and meander toward the Agua Fria River where we have an outlet basin to handle the discharge from the project. This slide presents a list of the project features. There is a combination of channels, storm drains and the basin, and here we have the Agua Fria River, as the components of the project.

The IGA simply authorizes that the District and the City of Peoria share in the construction and construction management costs equally 50/50. The City, as I mentioned, is a lead agency for all aspects of the project, and the city will also own, operate and maintain the completed project.

In closing, the recommendation of staff is that the Advisory Board endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors approve this IGA with the City of Peoria, for the Rose Garden Lane Channel Project, construction, operation, and maintenance. Are there any questions?

Ward: Questions? Gentlemen? I have a couple. The first one is why?

Rerick: Why the project?

Ward: Yes.

Rerick: There is a prevailing drainage problem from northeast to southwest that this project captures. In fact, there are some additional improvements that the City and developers are undertaking east and north of here, which in combination with this project will provide that protection. It will convey those flows which historically go to the Agua Fria River, but now will be diverted and more directly routed to the Agua Fria River along the Rose Garden Lane Channel Alignment. As I said, this is one of nine components that came out of the ADMP update.

- Ward:* I haven't been out there in a year, but I think I remember this area being a number of horse ranchettes. No?
- Rerick:* Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that there is more development out there; it is considerably more developed than that. There are numerous subdivisions in place, particularly south of Rose Garden Lane, and there are a number of subdivisions anticipated going in. It is considerably developed. It's similar to our 83rd and Pinnacle Peak project where there are a number lots split and large lot horse properties. Unlike that 83rd and Pinnacle Peak Project, this is, as you can see here, quite developed.
- Ward:* Did Hancock build a subdivision to the north of the drainage ditch as you go north from Rose Garden and you have to cross it by bridges or box culverts? I'm trying to remember the area.
- Rerick:* I'm not that familiar with that geography, but we do have Burton Charron who is representing the City of Peoria here. He is more familiar with the immediate area of development. He may be able to answer that question.
- Charron:* Burton Charron of City of Peoria with the Capital Improvements Project, draining project. I am not familiar with Hancock developments out there.
- Ward:* I'm just curious.
- Charron:* Okay.
- Rerick:* And both of those projects, both the 83rd and Pinnacle Peak that Burton is referring to and this one did come out of the same ADMP. They're geographically very close to each other.
- Ward:* Does Peoria require that all of the developers along Rose Garden Lane participate?
- Charron:* In original projects we normally don't, however we did in this instance, and we did particularly from 105th Avenue easterly through Lake Pleasant. It was a state landholding and the state land department met Peoria and the District to come up with a drainage scheme that mimicked what the ADMP was trying to accomplish.
- Patel:* I had a question about what is it going to look like. Is it something that the neighborhood can live with?
- Rerick:* Yes, it will consist of landscaped channels, obviously the box culvert here being underground. Until we get to this point, the channel then – where we don't have roadway frontage, where it will be obviously more visible, the channel then will become a gravel mulched and hydro-seeded earthen feature. And then at a point, as we approach the river, it becomes a concrete lined channel. Much farther out of sight, out of mind if you will, this parcel here is owned by a sand and gravel operation. This is an

SRP easement that will be crossed by the channel alignment. Peoria's in discussions with SRP and the State Land department and other entities for the acquisition of rights of way. So it will be minimally landscaped, Mr. Patel, it won't be as grand as some of our projects. Some people might consider that the wrong adjective, but it certainly won't be stark concrete.

Ward: What's the elevation like up there? Does it go from the river east or the other way? What is the grade?

Rerick: The grade is from east to west. The grade is falling noticeably when you're on Rose Garden Lane and driving west and there's a considerable grade change as you approach the river at about 112th Avenue. And then there's a significant grade change when you get obviously to the crossing at the river, so.

Ward: Any other questions? Thank you sir.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Patel and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3) FY 2006 THIRD QUARTER ENDING FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT

Information Only, No Action Required. Staff will provide an update report detailing the District's FY 2006 Financial Performance through the close of the Third Quarter.

Alexander: Good afternoon Chairman, members of the board, my task here today is to give you a comparative showing you exactly where we are through the third quarter fiscal year 2006. The first slide here is revenue and there are just a couple of items that I think we really need to look at. First one being is property taxes. Although we've only collected 63 percent through the end of March, second half of the tax year comes in April and May. Last year that was about \$20 million. With the new assessed value, I think we'll be easily – meet the 22. – or \$23 million remaining to collect.

The second item would be intergovernmental. That would be our partner sharing. That looks pretty bleak at the moment, but I think I can break them a little bit. Currently we have just under \$9 million in receivables. We also have nine projects that I know of currently under heavy construction, all of which are due to reach milestones in the next two months. The milestone will allow us to invoice our partner and we anticipate by the end of the fiscal year that we will have either collected, invoiced or accrued about \$20 million of the budgeted \$22.7. I think we'll collect about 95 to 96 percent of our total revenue by the year's end. That is very favorable, especially considering that the last two years we collected about 94 or 95 percent. I think we can do better than that this year.

I put this slide up to show you where I thought, or where we thought, when we started out the year, our revenue distribution would be. This is

where we are through the end of March. These are two totally different pictures however, as I just got finished explaining, we think that by the end of the year, this picture will be radically different for the reasons I've stated.

As far as expenses are concerned, this is our operating budget. The first one being the labor transfer item, the labor transfers in our case are primarily with MCDOT, and up until the end of March, we'd only been billed for the first quarter. So the number 441 vs. the 129 is going to change very radically, in fact it already has. We were billed in April of this month. The second item is the supplies expense. Although it looks like we haven't been spending most of our supplies expense, in fact we just started our dam gravel mulching program. It's a very expensive item and we really think that we will go through the \$807,000 worth, the vast majority of it, in the April/May/June period.

The third item Capital Acquisitions. It looks like we're behind our budget. I think that is indicative of the long lead time that we have to wait for our vehicles to arrive and in this fiscal year we also have considerable amount of construction equipment, heavy construction equipment, and the lead time on that is even longer. I do not anticipate we will spend all the funds; we will spend 80-85 percent of them.

I put this slide up to give you an idea of the expense distribution. Although some line items are lagging, the distribution is exactly as we anticipated when we put together our budget.

Although we still have about 45 percent of our funds to spend in the fourth quarter, we have nine projects that I know are in heavy construction, and as you can see most of the funds we have yet to spend are in construction. I think we will probably end the fiscal year with about 95 percent of our CIP spent. We're looking forward to a big third quarter at least we're geared up for it in finance.

Patel: A couple of questions. In regards to the licenses and permits, are we ahead of what we budgeted? Is there any anomaly there or?

Alexander: It is a very difficult item to budget because you don't know who's going to approach you and want to use your right-of-way easement.

Patel: Okay.

Alexander: This year, for whatever reason, we've had a number of easement sales.

Patel: One other question I was going to put to Mike, if you will be able to answer, or Tim, but have we had to do any kind of juggling at all with our projects in lieu of what's happening with costs, construction costs? And are you deferring anything, delaying anything, canceling anything?

Phillips: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Patel, to date, no. We are having some discussions with the City of Phoenix about some impacts that they may be having

and I would predict over the next year that we may have some discussions, but to date, we're looking at delivering projects and we have not had any delays other than the normal construction, but nothing related to cost-share partners not anteing up.

We are in for a little transition period; we have to watch how we finance and how we participate, that much closer than we have in the past to make sure that we have the cash flow and the revenues and the expenses all matching.

Ward: Good question.

Martin: How much actual cash do we got have in the bank right now?

Alexander: I can tell you what our fund balance is. That is very close to our actual cash. It's about \$21 million.

Martin: And you're only budgeting less than half a million for interest?

Alexander: This question was raised, I think, the last quarter, and I did call my contact at the treasurer's office and the way the interest rate is set is the way I had told you, is that the Board of Supervisors sets the interest rate that the County Treasurer will pay on funds deposited. Now where does the, you know, obviously they put that out for investment. Is there a difference between what they pay us and what they receive? I would think there is.

Martin: Julie, probably a question for you more than anybody else, under the charter that the Flood Control was established, is that legal? The Flood Control money in is being taxed as Flood Control money and it was supposed to go to the Flood Control under the supervisors. If you read the – I'm sure you've read the charter, I have, and I think that's probably part of the reason some of the cities a few years ago had objections to us handling their money and the County making money off of handling our money.

Lemmon: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Martin, first off I have to tell you that I have never done a lot of research into the interest rate itself and how it is figured. The District's statutes specifically allow the Board of Directors to use the County Treasurer, and that is their option to do that, so in terms of how the money's being handled, having him handled is part of your statutory set-up, I really don't know at this moment how to answer the rest of your question. In terms of whether there's a discrepancy between one interest rate or another, that's never been something that I have had the opportunity to look into.

Martin: It would bother me if I had \$20 million sitting in the bank and I got back less than a half a million dollars per year in interest. Why, that's cheap money.

Lemmon: I respectfully suggest that we could ask someone.

- Martin:* It's been several years since I read the charter but when I read the charter, when I first come came on the board to understand the Flood Control District, the tax was supposed to go to the Flood Control as being collected. Only collected by the County, but it was directly supposed to be for the budget of Flood Control.
- Lemmon:* Mr. Chairman, Mr. Martin, that is how the statute is written and myself and the County Attorney work very hard to make sure that your funds are kept separate and accounted for. As to the interest rate question, I don't really have enough information, but as I said, I respectfully request that we could probably ask that question and get someone to give you a better answer than I can give you. I do know that the pool, there's a pool that, in Flood Control dollars as well as other dollars are not used, they are loaned out and then the interest comes to us for tax anticipation notes and some of the different ways that the county does funding. But it is very clearly accounted for and I think if there was a problem on the accounting, Mike would let me know. I can do some questions and ask the County Attorney that works with the Treasurer's Office and see if we can find an answer for you.
- Martin:* Is anybody else on the board disturbed by that? I am
- Ward:* Thank you, Julie, I appreciate that.
- Ward:* That's a great question. We brought this up maybe a quarter or so ago and Mike, when you give OMB your money, do they own this money and then they pay you – it looks like it's what, about a one percent on the money annually? You can't go off and take this money with the help of your team and invest it directly, right?
- Alexander:* No sir. The money is held on deposit at by the County Treasurer.
- Ward:* And the County Treasurer, what's the agreement? That whatever balance you give them earns a percentage?
- Alexander:* I don't give them a balance.
- Ward:* That's not fair. That's supposed to be our money, right?
- Lemmon:* Mr. Chairman, members of the board, remember that the County Treasurer collects the taxes and collects for all of the entities that show up on the tax statement including the school districts and special districts. There's a whole number of them that he actually collects for and then parcels out the funds, so that in itself is not unusual because that's where you pay the tax bill to. You don't pay directly to Flood Control or to your school district or to CAWCD or any of the many entities that are on that list of entities. That's about as deep much as I know about tax collection.
- Justice:* That's not quite correct. With many of the special districts, the county cuts a check for the district each month for whatever monies they have

collected out of those taxes. Special districts then are allowed to invest those in secured funds, you can do it in a bank or you can do it in government securities. You can buy Jenny Mae's and those kinds of things through special districts. Now, what the differentiation is between the special district regulation and County Flood Control is about how that money is or can be controlled, I don't know that answer, but I do know that they can be in a couple of situations on – involving special districts that I am involved with. Used to be that one of them they owe, one of them they cut checks each month and we just said well, cut a check for this other one too, and they do that and there are constraints on what you can invest it in, but you can invest it in securities, U.S. Government, considerably more than what we're making on this, but I don't know what statutes the Flood Control falls under, obviously you do, and maybe that's something that we should take a look at and see exactly what our options are.

Phillips: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, we'll do that. We'll take a look and get your report back to you by the next meeting on what are the rules of engagement here, where does the money go, what happens to it, what do we get in return and we'll tell you what we find out.

Ward: Well I think these things have a great issue and if we're supposed to be autonomous, Tim, and based on our tax rate we get the money.

Martin: That's what the charter says.

Ward: Where do we put that money to get a better return and cover, you know, you're good business guys. Don't you think Mr. Patel?

Patel: Definitely.

Phillips: We will find out.

Ward: Very good. Are there any other questions for Mr. Alexander?

Patel: One more. You mentioned on the incoming side where other agencies owe us money because of the agreements and they were waiting for milestones. Is there anything on the other side where we owe money on projects where we're a partner? Because it's not flagged as a line item.

Alexander: Well no sir, we pay as you go.

Patel: Oh, okay.

Alexander: We are not on the pool payable approval until year end. No, we pay our bills as we receive them.

Ward: I have a question and if I'm going down the wrong road, let me know. Knowing how competitive the private sector is right now, do we have a fund available for Tim and his teams to go out and offer incentives in terms of compensation or benefits?

Phillips: No.

Ward: Is it strictly dictated –

Phillips: By the County.

Ward: By the County?

Phillips: Yes sir.

Ward: So the County controls your money and they dictate how much you can pay people?

Phillips: True statement.

Cherrington: You're surprised.

Ward: No. I'm just trying to help. I'm here strictly to try to find out and help, because you guys, I've told you this before, you run this as a great business and you do a lot of great projects, so –

Phillips: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, our Board of Directors has authorized the County Administration to provide oversight over us, that in essence is their call on how they chose to have us managed through the County structure. My experience with special taxing districts is very much the same; as it's collected by the County and given to you and you manage your money, but I think what's different here is that the Board of Directors of the District is the Board of Supervisors, and through their authorities in that role, have the County providing different levels of oversight and services on our behalf.

Martin: I think the problem there is the charter that was passed to create the flood control tax should control that, and it's been several years since I've read it, but if I remember right, I always thought that the money was passed right straight to the flood control, collected by the County but pass straight through them too. Four or five years ago we talked about interest rates and where they could put their money and etc., so something's happened in the last five or six years since I've been on the board, that if we're drawing one percent or less, I mean that's ridiculous.

Phillips: Well we'll get an answer to the question, and bring a report next month.

Patel: Is there another audit in the near future? I know we had one maybe a year or two ago where they looked at how this district is run and there were some concerns regarding the economy.

Phillips: I'm not aware of an audit coming up.

Alexander: We are undergoing the State Auditor General's.

Patel: This wasn't a financial audit; it was an operational audit.

Alexander: I remember it well. No sir, I don't know of any other audits coming down the road.

Patel: Okay.

Martin: The only reason I bring it up is when I was nominated to the board I thought I was here to protect the citizens that pay the money. I took that oath and I think it's my responsibility as a member of this board to bring something like that up. I'm not trying to knock you guys down any at all. I feel that as a taxpayer myself and representing the taxpayers, we should know – I'd hate to be in a meeting and have somebody say you have \$20 million in the bank and you made \$438,000 interest on it? What kind of a businessman are you, you know? I can feel that coming. And that's the only reason I bring it up, I don't bring it up to because of any problems. I think that we should have the answers.

Ward: I agree with you, you know, we're not a witch-hunt, we're just wanting to find out. I'd like to ask Mr. Acuna on what I perceive happening in the economy are costs are going up everyday, fuel's going up which impacts a lot of our construction, asphalt, steel, Ray, what do you see as you guys are sitting down at Phoenix? Because what's going to happen, I think, is our client cities are going to come back to us and say, there are only so many pieces in the apple. Ray, what do you see coming down the line in terms of revenues and expenses?

Acuna: Mr. Chairman this is walking a very fine line from – let me state, I'm an engineer and not a politician first. One of the most difficult parts as an engineer, having worked with the District for the better part of 15 years, is it's quite like working with Siamese twins. You have the Flood Control District who has a focused mission and a flood tax levy that helps us in the City of Phoenix provide flood protection to our citizens. However, they are not autonomous; they're tied to a very good county system. Phoenix and several other cities have had some reservations about that connection because it controls the money dictates, you know, the rules and it's just that there's a lot of pressure on the county to provide a lot of good services to the citizens in the County, but their mission is focused on flood control. We wanted to make sure that every penny that was taken, particularly from the citizens of Phoenix, for the flood tax levy went for flood control. And we're never sure whether we can go to our citizens and say that that's absolutely happened, or that it is happening, and that's kind of tough for us. Where that doesn't help us is that when our citizens pay into this flood tax levy, there's an expectation when they flood they're not going to be ignored, so there's a process here of planning and building projects and what I'm afraid of is that in the foreseeable future because of escalating material costs, what the public's going to see is no projects in some of the cities, not all of them. Some cities, because of the state shared revenue and the census are going to be pretty good for the next two or three years, but some of the larger cities, some of the cities with aging areas, in about two or three years, they're going to be calling us and saying "Where are you?" Because of the fact that our materials costs are going up, our buying power's going down,

and the question of how we can continue to partner with the Flood Control District in the future to build these projects, it's going to raise its ugly head again and I'm afraid the question's going to come up, is it still in our best interests to be a part of that team? And it's not the Flood Control District, it's those Siamese twins, they're inseparable. We need the Flood Control District, we need the County, but when it comes to flood control, we need the Flood Control District to be doing flood control with every penny that they get from the flood control tax levy, and there's some reservations as to whether we're receiving that full benefit and there's a thing called a cap. There's a cap on the flood tax levy, so if you live in Scottsdale and all the citizens of Scottsdale are contributing an amount of money for flood protection and if there's a cap placed on that flood protection, what you've done is you've hit the citizens twice, they've got decreased buying power because of increased land and materials costs and they've got the cap, so the result is going to be less flood control projects than we could possibly build with the flood tax levy. And it's a convoluted complex issue. One of the things that we've tried to do at the city is make sure that we have a good productive working relationship with the staff because they build things. But it's not just the Flood Control District staff that we're working with; it's that other, more challenging twin. Less projects in the future, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid.

Patel: And the cap you're talking about is that \$45 million.

Phillips: No, you're probably referring to the 2½ percent that Chairman Stapley put as a limit on our tax rate will be adjusted so that we gain no more revenues than 2½ percent over the year before.

Ward: But you collect more than you get to spend.

Phillips: Mike, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the theory is that they will adjust the tax rate based on the previous tax, the taxes that were just collected. Based on that projection, they'll adjust the tax rate so that your annual revenue increase is no more than 2½ percent of the property tax. So we will collect and be given all 2½ percent. The residents, their tax rate will be adjusted so that there is no more accumulated than the 2½ percent over the previously year's revenue. Is that correct Mike?

Alexander: That's correct.

Martin: We're not the beneficiaries of the increased property values. Property valuation is going up.

Phillips: That's true.

Acuna: We should, logically be beneficiaries of that.

Phillips: I can tell you that from my exposure with Chairman Stapley about this is that they did it for the library district also, and the perspective in is it stated the County address where he brought this issue up was within the

budget guidelines, so it's not a matter of police policy. The issue that he was trying to address is if we do not do it our self ourselves, that somebody will force it to occur because of the increases and assessed values. We've gained \$5 million or \$6 million a year in that where the primary property tax has a limit of 2½ percent. I guess by statute so it was more of a 'trying to do something before it was done to us' and out of our control would be how I perceived his measure, but it is part of the budget guidelines, not a matter of policy or statute.

Ward: Interesting discussion.

Phillips: One that we have had a few times internally ourselves.

Ward: Yeah, for sure. Thank you sir.

ACTION: No Action Required.

4) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Phillips: The next item on the agenda, Mr. Chairman, is my comments, and other than saying it's amazing how, although Dick Perreault's been gone for two months, you know, we've somehow managed without him, but he's doing just fine. He said it took him about a month to get over the 25 years of working here. I saw him yesterday and he had big smiles and not a care in the world. Other than that, we're continuing to do business how we've done business and we think that we'll be really close to spending probably over 95 percent, probably closer to 97-98 percent of our budget. As you recall last year, I think we were 95 percent of the operating and 84-85 percent of the CIP, although getting that close to your budget amount adds some different challenges. We are spending the money doing flood control projects that we're being given to spend and spending all of it that we can to put infrastructure, delineations or mitigation services in the ground. I don't have any other comments. Julie says she does have a few comments, but I'll be happy to answer any of your questions if you have any of me.

Ward: Julie, please.

Julie: Mr. Chairman, members of the board. Two things, first, quickly, I did not want to correct the minutes because I did say this, but in the interim since our last meeting, I ran into some representatives of Lockland's new owner at a meeting and I said they were in operation and that wasn't quite correct. They are correctly permitted but they are not at this moment operating. Since I said that I wanted to correct my statement. The other thing I would really like to do, it gives me much pleasure to introduce to you the new county counsel from the civil division who's assigned to work with us in the regulatory division. You remember David Benton and then Kevin Costello had been working with us, this is

Jerri Roll. This is her second week on the job, but she's already had lots of fun going to sand and gravel reclamation things, meetings with us, and she's going to be working with us, and so you'll occasionally see her sitting over here at the table.

Roll Thank you very much.

Lemmon: And thank you Jerri. You have anything you'd like to say?

Roll: No, I look forward to working with the Flood Control District. I've enjoyed it so far.

Lemmon: Thank you. And that's all I have to say.

Phillips: My Chairman, last item is yours on public comment, I believe.

Ward: Anybody in the audience that would like to say anything? Any thoughts, questions?

Martin: I'd just like to say it's nice to see Russ Miracle back from his extended vacation.

Chairman: Russ you're looking good. Glad to have you back. Thank you very much.

5) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Ward: Gentlemen, you've had a chance to look at the actions of the Board of Directors. Any thoughts, any problems, we make those part of the record.

6) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm